

I am confident that every Senator will incorporate this manual in his or her important office documents. As I have suggested earlier, it will probably end up occupying a significant spot in the office of every Senator. I think it is not likely to eliminate the need to call the Ethics Committee for advice, although it may make those phone calls less frequent.

The committee staff worked long and hard on this manual, and they deserve the appreciation of the Senate and the American people. In particular, Victor Baird, Linda Chapman, Elizabeth Ryan, Adam Bramwell, Marie Mullis, and Annette Gillis toiled long hours over the last several months to bring this project to fruition. They have turned out, in my view, a very fine product.

As I indicated earlier, one copy of this manual will be made available to each Senator. In fact, this afternoon, one copy will be delivered to each office. I am not going to ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it is quite thick, but I ask unanimous consent that the manual be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Then there will be sufficient copies available to committees and subcommittees as well as the general public.

So, Mr. President, I hope that this ethics manual will be useful to Members of the Senate and to others who will need to become at least generally familiar with the rules of the Senate.

Again, I thank the staff of the Ethics Committee for an outstanding piece of work. It was really quite a difficult project. I thank them on behalf of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with the time between now and 2:30 p.m. open for statements limited to 5 minutes each; I further ask that the time between 2:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. be under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the time between 3:30 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. be under the control of the Republican leader or his designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COLORADO ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I was shocked and saddened today to learn of the President's threat to eliminate or veto the parks bill that included a number of projects.

I was particularly disheartened over the decision to kill four Colorado environmental projects—surprised because, on a number of these, the administration has specifically reviewed them and signed off on them; that is, we had taken the trouble and the time to walk them through, to seek their advice, to incorporate their suggestions, and to work with them for something that could meet the President's guidelines.

Thus, after doing that—and having secured, at least in many of those projects, the administration's input and approval—we are now faced with a political hit list with regard to Colorado projects. I think it is particularly surprising when you look at where that hit list focuses. It focuses primarily in States where the President has had a difficult time in winning good reelection numbers—Alaska, Colorado, and Virginia are the heaviest hit on that hit list.

Mr. President, the projects in Colorado are bipartisan projects. They are ones that are of enormous benefit to the environment and the State. I hope that the President will reconsider.

This is raw politics to punish those who will not go along with the President's bid for reelection. And it is vindictive politics. It is beneath the Office of the President to engage in this kind of vindictive hit list based not on a rational review of the issues or reasonable discussions of the problems, but simply sending a cold power play to punish those States where the President's ratings are not high enough.

I called the White House this morning because I was concerned about these projects and about one project in particular which, I think, particularly saddens me, and asked why these projects were being eliminated. They were not able to give me an answer. The woman who was kind enough to chat with me did speculate with regard to one of them, and speculated that maybe they were concerned about it being a heritage area. And, of course, the major one involved the Cache La Poudre River bill which is not a heritage area. We specifically changed that aspect because Members of the House and others had concerns about heritage areas.

Mr. President, I want to talk for a moment about a project that we worked for more than 20 years on which is included in that Cache La

Poudre area bill. The Cache La Poudre River is a river that was named by the French, obviously, in the pioneer days. It is a river that has provided the flow of communications, water, transportation, and a lifeline throughout eastern Colorado. It starts in the high mountains in northern Colorado, in those high mountain regions, and it flows down toward the plains. It is now Colorado's only wild and scenic river. I offered that as a Member the House of Representatives.

Peter Dominick did a study perhaps three decades ago on wild and scenic rivers in the State. And it was a great pleasure for me to see the passage of that wild and scenic designation. While Peter Dominick has long passed away, his sons came to that signing ceremony. It was, I think, a token of something very important because it is an effort to preserve part of our national heritage.

The La Poudre bill the President now wants to veto is one that takes that area of the river as it passes through Fort Collins and extends out on the plains. The suggestion is very simple. Let us see if there is some way to set aside the floodplain of the river as it passes through the city of Fort Collins and Greeley and by the city of Windsor on its way. It is an area of rapid growth. It is in the middle of a great urban area stretching from Denver, or perhaps even Colorado Springs, all the way up to Cheyenne, WY.

What a wonderful thing to have set aside open space of a floodplain area for riding and bike paths and hiking paths and recreation facilities in the heart and the middle of a great metropolitan area.

Mr. President, as you well know, many in our part of the world are not so sure they want the heritage broke, and it is controversial. But the saddest thing of all would be to see it grow and for us not to prepare for it, plan for it, and set aside the open space that will keep some of the quality of life that has attracted so many to that part of the world.

That is really what this bill is all about. It does it without a cost to the U.S. Treasury.

It does it by saying if there is surplus land in the State that is federally owned, this bill allows the exchange of surplus land in other parts of Colorado for part of the flood plain of the Cache La Poudre. It will not have a net impact on the Treasury, but what it will do is gradually see land that is held by the Federal Government in areas where it is not needed exchanged for land in the flood plain of the Cache La Poudre River. It promises, I believe, over a lengthy period of time to give us a substantial amount of open space that will be preserved throughout the Republic to the lasting benefit of the community.

Frankly, I think it is a question that needs to be addressed in the Western United States itself. The West is blessed with a large amount of public

land held by the Federal Government, but I do not think anyone, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, would question the fact that sometimes that land is not held in the location where most would prefer it. Most of our land ends up being where settlers did not homestead it or where miners did not stake a claim. However, it is not the only basis that you ought to use for land allocation and ownership.

What this bill does is give us a chance to shift the ownership of the public land away from areas where it is not needed to areas where it clearly will be needed.

I cannot help but think that this measure has enormous environmental pluses in it, and I find myself dumbfounded that the President would choose to veto it. My hope is that the administration will be willing to sit down with us, let us know their concerns, and work things out if that is the case. But, also, I must say I am not willing to roll over on this. I am not willing to ignore good legislation. My suggestion is that if the President wants to work with Congress, he has to be willing to step forward and enunciate his concerns. Right now we are in a circumstance where the President has put these projects on a hit list without even being willing to name or articulate what his concerns are.

My belief is and always has been that good legislation is a product of thoughtful review and good communication between those involved not only at the legislative level but those outside of this body. I hope the President will reconsider his actions. Once before a President of the United States came up with a hit list for the Western United States. President Carter took vengeance out on the Western United States with his hit list. My hope is that President Clinton will not repeat that mistake.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

#### ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I take the floor to make a couple of comments about my extreme disappointment over the obvious fact that now this Congress will not be able to take up an agreement that has been worked on and negotiated for over 7 years that has now been completed but that will not be considered by our Congress through the ratification process.

The agreement that I speak to is the so-called OECD agreement, which is the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which has brought together the shipbuilding countries of the world, and after 7 years and two administrations nego-

tiating this agreement and having the other nations of the world that build ships sign on the dotted line saying that this agreement is right for this time, unfortunately, this Congress, and this Senate in particular, will not be in a position to even bring it up for ratification.

The bottom line is that this agreement, which has been negotiated for so long, has as its major purpose the ending of shipbuilding subsidies by the other countries of the world.

In my time in the Congress, I have heard from people who work in shipyards, people who own shipyards, people who have shipyards in their districts and in their States, that if we could only end the other countries' subsidies to their yards, government subsidies, we in the United States could not only compete with these other foreign shipyards but we could do much better than they are doing.

This agreement, I say to my colleagues and to all, does exactly that. After 7 years of negotiation under the leadership of the Clinton administration and Bush administration, both of which have said this is a priority, and this agreement has now been completed and signed, we at this last hour refuse to take it up because there are some in our country who have said it is not perfect so, if it is not perfect, we will not participate. The losers of this battle are the people who asked us to enter into these negotiations in the first place, the shipbuilding industry. It is unfortunate that now there is such a division among the industry that we in the Congress are not able to do something which helps everybody in a major way.

I am committed to continue our efforts in the next Congress. I am fearful, however, that other countries will see the U.S. lack of ratification of this international agreement to mean that they will then be able to engage in their own subsidy wars once again, and that will be most unfortunate because, if there is anything which is clear, it is that this country cannot participate and cannot win an international subsidy battle with other countries willing to heavily subsidize their shipbuilding industries as a matter of national policy.

We have no subsidies directly provided by our Government to our shipbuilding industry. That program, the construction subsidy differential program, was ended in the administration of President Ronald Reagan. He said we are not going to do that any more. Congress agreed, and there is no longer any shipbuilding subsidies in place for our yards in this country, but all the other countries that are major shipbuilders still have subsidy programs.

This international agreement got them all to sit down at the table after 7 years and say, all right, if everybody agrees they are not going to do it, we are not going to do it either.

That agreement is a win-win for the United States. Failure to ratify and ap-

prove that treaty is a lose-lose for the United States industry and the thousands and thousands of men and women who work in those industries, because if we do not enact this agreement and other countries continue to subsidize their yards, we will continue to lose business. We will continue to build only militarily useful vessels in this country and commercial shipbuilding will continue to go overseas to yards that are consistently subsidized by their governments, because in many of these countries shipbuilding is their biggest industry. It is not in our country, and therefore we do not subsidize it. This agreement would have put other countries on a level playing field with us.

I am struck by the fact that at the last minute, when some of our industry people came in and said, well, we do not like this agreement because of this, that and the other, my staff, USTR people, many Members of the Senate and in the House sat down and said, all right, we will try to get what we can to fix it to address your concerns. Those who opposed the treaty said, well, they needed explicit clarification that the United States would not under any circumstances change our Jones Act, and we did that and clarified that in the treaty, that that would be exactly the way they asked for it.

They said that they need explicit clarification that our national security interests would be protected by this treaty, and that the defense features and military reserve vessels would be outside of the agreement. And we put that into this treaty to be ratified.

They said they needed 30 additional months of the current title 11 financing program for our shipbuilders to cover projects that were close to having their applications in. And we did that.

They said they needed clarification that the limited restructuring subsidies for some countries, which were allowed under the agreement to four countries in order to reduce their shipbuilding capacity, would be actionable if they, in fact, increased their capacity instead of reduced their capacity. And we did that.

It is unfortunate that, in the end, some would agree only on a perfect agreement. If anyone has been here longer than 2 weeks, he or she knows there are no such things as perfect bills, perfect legislation, or perfect treaties—or perfect anything. We are humans who try to do the best we can. Perfection is not something that we, oftentimes, are able to achieve.

So, while this agreement may not have been perfect, we answered in each instance the opposition of those who continue to oppose this treaty. They, in my opinion, will be the ones who will ultimately suffer the most by their stopping this Congress from bringing forth this agreement for ratification.

I know there are a lot of people who worked very hard. I commend Congressman SAM GIBBONS, from the other body, who really tried to bring his people together on this issue. Senator BILL